This is author version of article published as:

Xavier, Robina J. and Patel, Amisha M. and Johnston, Kim A. (2005) Examining objectives and evaluation: How practitioners measure their success. In *Proceedings 12th BledCom: Public relations metrics: Evaluation and measurement; The International Public Relations Research Symposium*, Bled, Slovenia.

Examining objectives and evaluation: How practitioners measure their success.

Robina Xavier, Amisha Patel and Kim Johnston

Abstract

Public relations professionals use many different methods to demonstrate their contribution to organizational goals, yet it is unclear how the reporting of public relations success measures up to real outcomes. Ten years after the International Public Relations Association produced a gold paper on public relations evaluation, this study uses data from industry campaign awards to identify how practitioners use evaluation to demonstrate their success. Results suggest that media evaluation methods continue to dominate evaluation techniques and practitioners often mismatch objective and evaluation types in their campaign reporting, and fail to demonstrate how specific objectives have been achieved.

Introduction

Public relations helps organizations establish reputations (Plowman, Briggs, and Huang, 2001), improve community relationships (Ledingham and Bruning, 2000), resolve conflict (Coombs, 2001) change attitudes and behaviors (Cutlip, Center, and Broom, 2000; Hendrix, 2004) and achieve organizational targets (Hon, 1998). While such outcomes are valued, managers are increasingly demanding evidence of public relations' contribution to these organizational goals (Stacks, 2002).

Public relations program evaluation plays a significant role in demonstrating accountability (Wilson, 1992), determining effectiveness (Dozier, 1990; Fairchild, 2002), and supporting a strategic contribution to the organization (Radford and Goldstein, 2002). As there is no one method for measuring public relations effectiveness (Hon, 1998; Lindenmann, 1993), practitioners select among an array of different methods and models to demonstrate their effectiveness.

In 1994, the International Public Relations Association (IPRA) in conjunction with the Public Relations Institute of Australia (PRIA) and Public Relations Institute of South Africa (PRISA) produced a gold paper on public relations evaluation, stressing the need for professionals to demonstrate their accountability through evaluation (IPRA, 1994). A decade on, evaluation and accountability are recognized as a strong part of good practice (McCoy and Hargie, 2003). However, some authors (Gregory, 2001; Kelly, 2001; Phillips, 2001; Watson, 2001) suggest that practitioners still have limited understanding of the use of evaluation research or restrict its use to particular types. In some cases, practitioners cite the 'intangibility' of public relations work as a significant influence on limiting evaluating in practice (Hon, 1998). In studies undertaken by Pohl and Vandeventer (2001) and Gregory (2001), less than half of the respondents identified formal evaluation methods in their campaign plans. Paradoxically, practitioners suggested that the pressure to keep achieving sound levels of performance meant that no time was available for evaluation to demonstrate that performance (Gregory, 2001; Hon 1998; Pohl and Vandeventer, 2001).

Research into practitioner evaluation usage suggests that no one country practises evaluation more than another (IPRA, 1994). Pieczka (2000) studied entries in the

United Kingdom's Sword of Excellence awards spanning 13 years from 1984, and found most campaigns contained twice as many evaluations methods than objectives, suggesting there was no clear relationship between stated program objectives and evaluation. While Pieczka acknowledged the rhetorical demands of writing cases for competition may have influenced the presentation of objectives and evaluation, the analysis supported that programs generally lacked qualities of measurability and any systematic approach to research and evaluation. In a Canadian study on practitioner evaluation techniques, Piekos and Einsiedel (1990) found scientific research methods were seldom used for impact evaluation and similar results were reported by Dozier (1990) who found that the more scientific the style, the less frequently it is used.

While Center and Jackson (2003) consider that measurement and evaluation have emerged as central to effective practice, it is unclear how the reporting of public relations success measures up to the actual achievement of outcomes. Macnamara (2002) suggests there is a 'worldwide philosophical consensus' (p.102) by the public relations industry on the importance of evaluation, but notes a continuing low application of evaluation in practice. Research into practitioner attitudes and evaluation research practice consistently reflects an opinion that evaluation is essential to practice but it is still talked about more than practised (Gregory, 2001; Judd, 1990; Walker, 1997; Watson, 1996).

Center and Jackson (2003) contend that many programs are launched without thought of long term monitoring and measurement. Whereas Cutlip et al (2000) suggest there is an increasing emphasis on measuring program outcomes in terms of the impact on particular publics as opposed to the outputs of implementation, a number of studies have established that generally the application of evaluation is restricted to program output (Gregory, 2001; Pohl and Vandeventer, 2001; Walker, 1994; Watson, 1997). Cutlip et al (2000) note that this focus on outputs may be due to the convenience and accessibility of data to inform such evaluation.

While public relations scholars dedicate chapters to research and evaluation (see, for example, Cutlip et al, 2000; Grunig and Repper, 1992; Guth and Marsh, 2003; Heath, 2001) to inform better practice, research suggests that practitioners still make common errors in applying evaluation techniques to their campaigns. Gregory's

(2001) study of 23 award wining public relations cases found a mismatch between stated levels of objectives and evaluation types, and that a number of practitioners implied success at a higher level from evaluating lower level objectives. Pieczka (2000) also found a general illogical mismatching of objective and evaluation types confirming Cutlip et al's (2000) claim that one of the most common errors involves the substitution of measures from one level (preparation/implementation/impact or input/output/outcome) for those at another level. For example, practitioners may use the number of media releases sent (an output measure during program implementation) as a measure of program effectiveness (impact), despite there being no demonstrated link to an outcome for a particular public or its relationship with the sponsoring organization. This inaccurate application not only impacts a particular campaign but may have the cumulative effect of limiting the demonstration of public relations contribution to organizational outcomes in general (Dozier, 1990).

Given the international interest in evaluation practice, this study sought to review contemporary Australian practice and consider what types of evaluation methods are being used by practitioners and whether appropriate evaluation methods were being used to measure campaign objectives.

Research questions

A set of questions related to the reviewed literature was used to guide this study:

Research question 1: What methods of evaluation are Australian practitioners using to demonstrate performance?

Research question 2: Do evaluation measures in Australian public relations campaigns accurately demonstrate the achievement of campaign objectives?

Methodology

To examine trends in public relations objective-setting and evaluation, this study analyzed award-winning public relations cases against academic planning frameworks. A coding instrument was developed with coding items drawn principally from Hendrix's (2004) hierarchy of objectives and corresponding evaluation approaches (see Table 1). Hendrix differentiates between output objectives, and outcome objectives which include informational, attitudinal, and behavioral categories. To match these objective categories, Hendrix (2004) assigned evaluation items. While other authors broadly agree with the categorization scheme, many disagree with Hendrix's treatment of "messages placed" as an informational objective outcome and evaluation type. As a result, the coding instrument has been adapted to reflect Cutlip et al's (2000) hierarchy of outcomes, which treats "messages placed" as an output objective and output evaluation.

Two units of analysis operate in this paper. To understand what methods of evaluation were used by practitioners, each case was examined. This unit captures evaluation types at a case level. Then within each case, the objective type (output, informational, attitudinal, behavioral) as well as the corresponding evaluation type (output, informational, attitudinal, behavioral) was examined. This second unit of analysis is at the objective and evaluation type level.

Table 1: List of objective and evaluation categories and evaluation methods

	Descriptors for objective setting and evaluation	**Evaluation methods**
Output	Messages sent, placed	Media preparation and distribution, Collateral preparation and distribution, media monitoring, media content analysis, advertising value equivalence.
Outcome – informational	Messages received, attended to, learnt	Readability, surveys, anecdotal feedback.
Outcome – attitudinal	Opinions and attitudes changed or reinforced	Surveys, focus groups, anecdotal feedback, online surveys, pre-test research methods
Outcome – behavioral	Behaviors enacted, changed and business indicators	Surveys, anecdotal feedback, online surveys, pre-test research methods, observation, attendance and registration, calls received, website hits, sales, legislation, profits, funds raised.

Reference: Adapted from Hendrix (2004) and Cutlip et al (2000).

Sample

The sample for this research is taken from award-winning entries to the PRIA Golden Target Awards in 2003. Fifty-nine public relations cases awarded at both State and National levels were analyzed. To receive a National Golden Target award, cases must first receive a State award. These awards span seven categories: comprehensive communication program, community communication, employee or member communication, government communication, investor or financial communication, issues or crisis management, and marketing communication. Entries are judged by a panel of senior public relations practitioners and academics at a State and Federal level and awarded gold, highly commended or commended against set criteria determined by the PRIA. Entries must meet specific formatting requirements. Each entry is limited to 2,200 words and must include the following sections: executive summary, situation analysis, goals and objectives, research, target publics, communication strategy and implementation, budget, results, and evaluation.

For this study, the specific units of observation were the goals and objectives, and the results and evaluation sections of each Golden Target Award. The PRIA entry criteria for each section are described in the table below.

Table 2: PRIA awards criteria

	Criteria
Objectives	Describe the goals and the measurable objectives of the program.
Results	Outline what the program achieved and provide evidence of the results.
Evaluation	Assess the outcomes of the program in relation to its objectives. Please note that editorial and advertising should not be directly compared because the PRIA does not recognize Advertising Value Equivalents of editorial media coverage as a reliable or valid evaluation methodology (PRIA, 1999).

Reference: PRIA Golden Target Awards Entry Criteria, 2003

Data analysis and coding

Data were coded against the categories and methods listed in Table 1. Prior to data collection, the research instrument was tested three times by one coder against three cases and reviewed by the other members of the research team. Coding categories and operational definitions were refined and retested.

Data from the 59 cases were entered into Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). Frequency counts and descriptive statistics were calculated for the relevant variables with chi square analyses conducted where necessary to ascertain the significance of the frequency distribution by comparing expected and observed frequencies. For continuous variables such as the total number of evaluation methods used per campaign, the normality of the distribution was also tested with skewness and kurtosis measures.

Limitations

There are several limitations for this study. This paper focuses on post campaign evaluation practices as represented by output and outcome evaluation methods and thus, excludes input evaluation. The sample includes only those cases that were entered into the PRIA's awards, thereby representing a limited percentage of public relations campaigns implemented in Australia. Entry is only open to PRIA members, therefore this study does not map the evaluation practices of non-PRIA members who represent a significant part of the Australian industry. The sample also only includes award-winning cases, thus relying on the original judges' understanding and application of criteria for an entry to be included in the sample.

Walker (1994) set a precedent for using this sample in reporting research trends in Australian public relations and the sample has been used in a number of later studies (see Xavier, Johnston, and Patel, 2003; Xavier and Patel, 2004; Xavier, Patel, and Johnston, 2004;Walker, 1994) acknowledged additional limitations in practitioner reporting of evaluation methods potentially caused by low familiarity with research terminology. Further, the award entry may not give a true or complete picture of the public relations program due to the screening of information by the client, the sensitive nature of some issues and campaigns, and word limitations on entries (Pieczka, 2000; Walker, 1994).

Results

What methods of evaluation are Australian practitioners using to demonstrate performance?

Across the cases, practitioners used a range of output, informational, attitudinal, and behavioral evaluation types to demonstrate performance. Between four and five evaluation types ($M = 4.56$, $SD = 2.42$) were used on average per campaign. On average, there was a greater use of impact evaluation types ($M = 2.73$, $SD = 1.85$) per campaign than output evaluation types ($M = 1.83$, $SD = 1.30$).

Impact evaluation types were further categorized to identify the average number of informational ($M = 0.49$, $SD = 0.88$), attitudinal ($M = 0.37$, $SD = 0.64$), and behavioral ($M = 1.86$, $SD = 1.32$) evaluation types. A comparison of output types against this expanded impact set identified no significant correlation against the number of informational evaluation types ($r = .029$, $N = 59$, $p > .05$), attitudinal evaluation methods used ($r = -.07$, $N = 59$, $p > .05$), or behavioral evaluation methods ($r = .24$, $N = 59$, $p > .05$). However, within the impact evaluation category, there is a significant correlation between the use of informational evaluation and attitudinal evaluation ($r = .28$, $N = 59$, $p = .031$) within a campaign. There were no significant correlations between any other combinations of evaluation types.

The 15 most frequently used evaluation tools are listed in Table 3.

Table 3. Top 15 most used evaluation tools per campaign

Evaluation method	Type	Number of campaigns using tool	Percentage of campaigns using tool (%)
Media monitoring	Output	33	55.93
Media content analysis	Output	23	38.98
Attendance	Behavioral	23	38.98
Web hits	Behavioral	16	27.12
Surveys	Informational/ attitudinal	16	27.12
Anecdotal feedback	Information/ Attitudinal/ behavioral	16	27.12
Collateral distribution	Output	14	23.73
Sales	Behavioral	13	22.03
Media distribution	Output	13	22.03
Registrations	Behavioral	12	20.34
Calls received	Behavioral	11	18.64

Circulation figures	Output	9	15.25
Relationships	Behavioral	7	11.86
Activity outcome	Behavioral	6	10.17
Legislation	Behavioral	5	8.47

Output evaluation tools were used consistently across the cases, with an emphasis on media-based tools that measured message exposure. Informational evaluation tools within the cases focused on measuring message retention through surveys and anecdotal feedback whereas message comprehension was measured through readability scores, surveys and anecdotal feedback. The cases used attitudinal evaluation tools such as surveys, anecdotal feedback and focus groups to measure a change in attitudes or opinions. A range of behavioral evaluation tools were used across the cases to determine if target publics behaved as desired or repeated behaviors, and if business indicators such as sales, profit and legislation changes were achieved. These included count statistics such as attendance figures, website hits, registration figures and calls received, as well as relationship assessments and anecdotal feedback. Key business indicators reported by practitioners included sales increases, activity outcome and legislative changes.

Media based evaluation was favored within the campaigns. Media monitoring was used in more campaigns than any other evaluation tool with three media evaluation methods ranked in the top 10 evaluation methods across the campaigns.

Table 4. Media based evaluation across campaigns

Evaluation method	Evaluation type	Number of campaigns using tool	Percentage of campaigns using tool (%)
Media monitoring	Output	33	55.93
Media content analysis	Output	23	38.98
Media distribution	Output	13	22.03
Circulation figures	Output	9	15.25

Do evaluation measures in Australian public relations campaigns accurately demonstrate the achievement of campaign objectives?

To identify the match between objectives types and evaluation types, each objective within each campaign was firstly examined and categorised as output, informational, attitudinal or behavioral.

The total number of objectives across the 59 campaigns was 264, representing an average of 4.47 objectives per campaign. This is considerably higher than Pieczka's (2000) study of English campaigns which had an average of 2.8 objectives per campaign. Forty of the 264 objectives contained in this study's sample listed multiple outcomes within the one objective. Each part of the multiple objective was treated separately in the analysis to match with an appropriate evaluation method. Therefore, the total number of objectives classified by type for the study is 309. The combinations within multiple objectives were examined to see if practitioners were more or less likely to use particular objective types when setting the objectives. Within multiple objectives, output is less likely to be used (χ^2 (1, N = 264) = 10.00, p = .002), behavioral impact is more likely to be used (χ^2 (1, N = 264) = 4.90, p = .027), and there is no significant difference in the use or non-use of informational or attitudinal types.

Following the categorization of objectives by type, the paper first identified the degree of match between the number of objective and evaluation types, following Pieczka's (2000) research. Within the sample, 332 methods were used to evaluate 309 objective types. Although there is a mismatch in the number of evaluation methods to objectives, the results of this study show stronger agreement compared to Pieczka's (2000) finding that most campaigns contained twice as many evaluations methods than objectives.

Next, an analysis was undertaken of the results and evaluation sections of each campaign document to ascertain which evaluation method was being used to evaluate each objective. Where evaluation methods were identified, the type of evaluation method (output, informational, attitudinal, behavioral) was matched against the objective type (output, informational, attitudinal, behavioral). The data were then analyzed to identify the most common matches (e.g. output objective measured by output evaluation method) and mismatches (e.g. behavioral objective measured by informational evaluation method).

The first key finding in this analysis was that approximately one quarter of objectives within the sample were not evaluated using a specified evaluation method. This was particularly prevalent for informational objectives and ranked as the second highest category of match/mismatch for both output and informational objective types. This lack of specificity does not necessarily equate to an absence of evaluation within the campaigns. Rather, it refers to the inclusion of evaluation methods or results that did not correspond to any of the objectives noted in the campaign.

Secondly, results showed that practitioners used a mix of evaluation types to evaluate each specific objective type as outlined in Table 5. Within the sample, all three categories of impact level objectives (informational, attitudinal and behavioral) were evaluated using all four categories of evaluation types, providing a considerable level of objective-evaluation mismatching across the sample. Output objectives were also evaluated using a variety of methods with three different categories of evaluation methods being noted across the sample.

Output level objectives were evaluated using output, informational and behavioral evaluation methods. However, output level objectives were evaluated most often by output evaluation methods (χ^2 (2, N = 64) = 31.16, $p < .001$).

Informational level objectives were evaluated using output, informational, attitudinal, and behavioral tools and were more likely to be evaluated using either non-informational or non-reported evaluation methods (χ^2 (2, N = 103) = 10.80, p = .005).

Attitudinal level objectives were evaluated using all categories of evaluation methods but more frequently used attitudinal or behavioral evaluation tools. For attitudinal objectives, there is no significant difference in the use or non-use of attitudinal evaluation methods, or the non-reporting of evaluation methods (χ^2 (2, N = 49) = .776, $p > .05$).

Behavioral level objectives also were evaluated with all evaluation categories but more frequently used behavioral evaluation methods. For behavioral objectives, behavioral evaluation was more likely to be used than either a non-behavioral or a non-reported evaluation method (χ^2 (2, N = 93) = 43.61, p < .001).

Table 5. Match of evaluation type to objective type across all objectives

Objective type	**Evaluation type**				
	Output	**Informational**	**Attitudinal**	**Behavioral**	**Evaluation not specified for the objective**
Output	41	2	0	12	18
Informational	47	19	3	17	39
Attitudinal	14	4	16	16	14
Behavioral	16	8	5	61	15

Discussion

Given the diversity of public relations practice, it is likely that effectiveness and accountability can best be demonstrated by applying an array of different evaluation methods. Australian practitioners appear to have taken up this challenge and are utilising a variety of evaluation techniques, however, this study suggests the choice of evaluation tool is not always appropriate to the outcome being measured.

Of the four categories of output, informational, attitudinal and behavioral evaluation methods, practitioners continue to favor output techniques, in particular, media monitoring and media content analysis. These results confirm a similar preference for media evaluation methods found in Walker's (1997, 1994) study of Australian public relations practice and a longitudinal study of Australian public relations campaigns from the period 1997 to 2001 (Xavier et al, 2004) and support Pieczka's (2000) suggestion that practitioners favor publicly visible measures to demonstrate their achievements to clients. Although Nobel (1999) suggests practitioners can make cautious links between media evaluation and campaign results, the findings of this study suggest that such caution is not being heeded by Australian public relations practitioners.

Before public relations can accurately claim credit for its contribution to organizational outcomes, practitioners must clearly demonstrate the link between the objectives set for a campaign or program and the outcomes achieved. This study suggests considerable improvement is needed before Australian practitioners can claim such an achievement. The high number of objectives being set but not accounted for in the evaluation process is of major concern. Further research is needed to determine whether practitioners did not believe the objectives were worth measuring or whether they lacked the ability to measure them and hence avoided the issue by reporting in other ways. If the former is true, then practitioners are failing in their quest to make their achievements valued by others. If the latter is true, then further efforts are needed by industry and the academy to assist practitioners build their evaluation capabilities. Lack of research skills has not only been identified as a constraint on appropriate evaluation of public relations campaigns (Walker, 1997) but also as a limiting factor in the career progression of public relations practitioners (Cutlip et al, 2000; Kelly, 2001), increasing the likelihood of a practitioner focus on technician-style or process skills which provide little direct reference to achieving organizational goals.

Practitioners do appear to be demonstrating some understanding of the different categories of objectives and evaluation and are using appropriately matched techniques in some of the categories, particularly for output objectives. However, the high use of output evaluation techniques such as media evaluation for informational objectives and the strong use of both attitudinal and behavioral evaluation to assess attitudinal objectives suggests further attention needs to be paid to this important part of campaign planning and assessment.

Center and Jackson (2003) suggest that there is an increasing emphasis on behavioral measurement in public relations. While a number of studies have not found such an emphasis to be demonstrated (Watson, 1992; Walker, 1994; Pohl and Vandeventer, 2001), the cases analyzed in this study did show a strong focus on behavioral objectives and evaluation techniques. However, further analysis suggests that practitioners are mostly using the lowest levels of audience impact to claim success in these areas. For example, behavioral objectives seeking behavioral change are being evaluated mostly using website hits or registrations rather than observable changes to behavior or outcomes specifically linked to organizational goals. Future campaign analysis can focus on the specific levels within each objective type such as comprehension, attention and retention for informational objectives and behave as desired, repeat behavior, achieve social and cultural change and achieve specific business indicators for behavioral objectives to further ascertain the accuracy of matching. Such analysis is needed to truly demonstrate the improvement in public relations accountability and effectiveness.

Finally, practitioners need to be encouraged to support their claims of success through pre and post testing with key publics. Less than 10 percent of the cases in the sample attempted any such comparison which is important to show the specific impact of the public relations effort. Practitioners also need to be discouraged from using multiple outcome objectives which cloud evaluation practices and make it difficult to see results directly matched to program goals.

The true value of public relations as a management function will not be realized unless public relations practitioners can consistently demonstrate its contribution to organizational goals. Central to such demonstration is the ability to apply appropriate evaluation techniques to measure campaign success and to focus on behavioral outcomes (Center and Jackson, 2003) as opposed to measures of campaign output. Therefore, industry bodies and the academy need to continue to provide practitioner support and education to aid improvement in practice and to benchmark such improvements through the analysis of campaign performance.

References

Center, A., and Jackson, P. (2003). *Public Relations Practices* (6th ed.). New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Coombs, T. (2001). Interpersonal Communication and Public Relations. In R. L. Heath (Ed.), *Handbook of Public Relations* (pp. 105-114). Ca: Sage Publications.

Cutlip, S., Center, A., and Broom, G. (2000). *Effective Public Relations* (8th ed.). New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Dozier, D. M. (1990). The innovation of research in public relations practice: Review of a program of studies. *Public Relations Research Annual, 2*, 3-28.

Fairchild, M. (2002). Evaluation: An opportunity to raise the standing of PR. *Journal of Communication Management, 6*(4), 305-307.

Gregory, A. (2001). Public relations and evaluation: does the reality match the rhetoric? *Journal of Marketing Communications, 7*(3), 171-189.

Grunig, J. E., and Repper, F. C. (1992). Strategic Management, Publics and Issues. In J. E. Grunig (Ed.), *Effective Public Relations* (pp. 117-158). New Jersey,: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Guth, D. W., and Marsh, C. (2003). *Public Relations: A values-driven approach*. Boston: Pearson Education.

Heath, R. L. (Ed.). (2001). *Handbook of Public Relations*. Ca: Sage Publications.

Hendrix, J. A. (2004). *Public Relations Cases*. California: Wadsworth Thomson Learning.

Hon, L. C. (1998). Demonstrating effectiveness in public relations: goals, objectives and evaluation. *Journal of Public Relations Research, 10*(2), 103-135.

IPRA. (1994). *Public relations evaluation: professional accountability*. Geneva: International Public Relations Association.

Judd, L. R. (1990). Importance and use of formal research and evaluation. *Public Relations Review, 16*(4), 17-28.

Kelly, K. S. (2001). Stewardship - The Fifth step in the Public Relations Process. In R. L. Heath (Ed.), *Handbook of Public Relations* (pp. 279-290). Ca: Sage Publications.

Ledingham, J. A., and Bruning, S. D. (2000). *Public Relations as Relationship Management.* New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Lindenmann, W. (1993). An ‘effectiveness yardstick’ to measure public relations success. *Public Relations Quarterly, 38*, 7-10.

Macnamara, J. (2002). Research and Evaluation. In C. Tymson, P. Lazar and R. Lazar (Eds.), *The New Australian and New Zealand Public Relations Manual* (pp. 100-135). Sydney: Tymson Communications.

McCoy, M., and Hargie, O. (2003). Implications of mass communication theory for asymmetric public relations evaluation. *Journal of Communication Management, 7*(4), 304-316.

Noble, P. (1999). Towards an inclusive evaluation methodology. *Corporate Communications*, *4* (1), 14-23

Phillips, D. (2001). The public relations evaluationists. *Corporate Communications, 6*(4), 225-237.

Pieczka, M. (2000). Objectives and evaluation in public relations work: what do they tell us about expertise and professionalism. *Journal of Public Relations Research, 12*(3), 211-233.

Piekos, J., and Einsiedel, E. (1990). Roles and program evaluation techniques among Canadian public relations practitioners. *Public Relations Research Annual, 2*, 95-113.
Plowman, K. D., Briggs, W. G., and Huang, Y. H. (2001). Public relations and conflict resolution. In R. L. Heath (Ed.), *Handbook of Public Relations* (pp. 301-310). Ca: Sage Publications.
Pohl, G., and Vandeventer, D. (2001). The Workplace, Undergraduate Education and Career Preparation. In R. L. Heath (Ed.), *Handbook of Public Relations* (pp. 357-368.). Ca: Sage Publications.
Radford, G. P., and Goldstein, S. Z. (2002). The role of research methods in corporate communication. *Corporate Communications: An International Journal, 7*(4), 252-256.
Stacks, D. (2002). *Primer of public relations research*. NY: Guilford.
Walker, G. (1994). Communicating Public Relations Research. *Journal of Public Relations Research, 6*(3), 141-161.
Walker, G. (1997). Public relations practitioners' use of research, measurement and evaluation. *Australian Journal of Communication, 24*(2), 97-113.
Watson, T. (1996). *Public Relations Evaluation: The Second Nationwide Survey of Practice in the United Kingdom.* Unpublished manuscript, Winchester, UK.
Watson, T. (1997). Measuring the success rate: Evaluating the PR process and PR programmes. In P. J. Kitchen (Ed.), *Public Relations: Principles and Practices* (pp. 283-299). Boston: International Thomson Business Press.
Watson, T. (2001). Integrated Planning and Evaluation. In R. L. Heath (Ed.), *Handbook of Public Relations*. (pp 259-268) Ca: Sage Publications,.
Wilson, L. J. (1992). Extending Strategic Planning to Communication Tactics. In R. L. Heath (Ed.), *Handbook of Public Relations* (pp. 521-526). Ca: Sage.
Xavier, R., Johnston, K. A., and Patel, A. M. (2003). *Trends in public relations campaign research: An analysis of research methods used by public relations practitioners in campaign development.* Paper presented at the Australian New Zealand Communication Association Conference, QUT, Brisbane, Australia.
Xavier, R., and Patel, A. M. (2004). *Accountability through objective setting: an evaluation of program objectives in advertising and marketing communication.* Paper presented at the Australian New Zealand Marketing Academy Conference, Wellington, New Zealand.
Xavier, R., Patel, A. M., and Johnston, K. A. (2004). *Are we really making a difference? The gap between outcomes and evaluation research in public relations campaigns.* Paper presented at the Australian New Zealand Communication Association Conference, University of Sydney.